



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,988	05/11/2006	Masaki Fujiwara	10873.1765USWO	5122

53148 7590 03/09/2011
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 2902
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902

EXAMINER

DIETERLE, JENNIFER M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1759

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/09/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/578,988	Applicant(s) FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer Dieterle	Art Unit 1759	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Nonfinal

(1) Jennifer Dieterle.

(3) _____.

(2) Douglas Mueller.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 March 2011

Time: 10am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Final rejection mailed 2/16/11.

Claims discussed:

n/a

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Alexa D. Neckel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1723

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Mr. Mueller contacted the examiner on 3/2/11 regarding the final action mailed 2/16/11. Mr Mueller noted that upon filing an RCE on 12/7/10 he had also requested suspension of the action. The examiner noted that Mr Mueller had two options. The first option would be for the examiner to vacate the action and amended claims would need to be submitted by 3/7/11 (i.e. the three month extension date). The second option would be for the examiner to change the final action mailed 2/16/11 to a nonfinal and Mr. Mueller would then have the opportunity to file amended claims in his response to the nonfinal. The examiner will then treat these amended claims as a nonfinal and mail a nonfinal action on the merits.

Mr. Mueller contacted the examiner on 3/7/11 noting that he would prefer the second option and will be submitting amended claims.

However, it is noted that if claim amendments are not filed in response to the final action mailed 2/16/11 (i.e. now coded as a nonfinal), the subsequent action will be a final.